UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,694	12/29/2003	Dimitry Gorinevsky	H0006745 US	2154
Kris T. Fredrick	7590 10/16/200	EXAMINER		
Patent Srvices		BLOOM, NATHAN J		
Honeywell International Inc. 101 Columbia Road Morristown, NJ 07962			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/749,694	GORINEVSKY, DIMITRY	
Examiner	Art Unit	
NATHAN BLOOM	2624	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>02 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDIT	TON FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a N application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in confor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must periods:	t, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the inpliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) W MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	the mailing date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 3: have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the n may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	g amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37 Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set for AMENDMENTS	37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
	a a brief will not be entered because
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by mate appeal; and/or	erially reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of f NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	inally rejected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of	Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a sent non-allowable claim(s).	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	b) 🔲 will be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of f because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why th was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but pri entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections und showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presentation.	ler appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claim REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	s after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the appleance Continuation Sheet.	lication in condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).13. ☐ Other:	
Indian Ollar	
/Brian Q Le/ Primary Examin	er, Art Unit 2624

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: No amendment to the claim language was made, and the presented arguments are not persuasive:

Applicant argued that no motivation was provided for combining the references used in the rejection of claim 1. - Please see page 7 of the office action wherein Lavenier provides the motivation for combination of Biemond and Owens, and page 8 contains the motivation for combination of Okuda with the other references (process data in real time).

Applicant argued that Okuda reference does not teach deblurring. - Please see page 8 of the office action wherein Okuda is relied upon for teaching a processing method that speeds up processing in order to process data in real time (teaches that real-time processing is desirable and obtainable with a parallel processing system).

Applicant argued that there is no teaching of data being processed only between adjacent blocks. - Please see figure 4 of Owens which shows that the processing block interconnections are only attached to adjacent processing elements.

Applicant argued that there was no argument or teaching of the equation of claim 3. - Please see page 11 of the office action and Biemond's equations 56 and 57 on page 865 of the cited document, which detail an equation utilizing a different regularization technique, but in view of Gorinesky's teachings of regularization correction the regularization term S becomes obviated.